

POLITICAL RECORD OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS.

"INTERVENTION MEANS DISUNION."

Congressional intervention in regard to slavery in the Territories, and intervention, too, against slavery have been the policy of this Government from its earliest existence down to 1850. This every one acquainted with the history of the country knows. As proof of the fact, witness the ordinance of 1787 drafted by Jefferson himself, and which secured Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin to freedom and free labor forever; also, the Missouri Compromise of 1820, which was intended to secure all North of that line—36 deg. 30 min.—to freedom also, and which existed in full force till the "ruthless hand" of Douglas destroyed it in 1854.

In the face of facts and of history, and of his own political record, as well as in the face of common sense, Mr. Douglas has the audacity to declare that "intervention means disunion!" In his late Washington harangues, on the night of the 4th of August, and afterwards in his letter of acceptance, he announced this astounding theory, and he loudly and repeatedly reiterated it. "The public and private hundred times since—that intervention means disunion," and that the only thing which can possibly save the country is "my great principle," popular sovereignty and non-intervention! His followers have taken the cue, regardless of facts or of consequences, and are raising the silly cry that Republicans, as well as the National Democracy, are all disunionists, because they believe that both Douglas and his dogma of popular sovereignty are most consummate humbugs!

"Intervention means disunion!" does it? Since when has this begun to be the case? We advise Mr. Douglas and his organs to be a little careful how they handle edge tools. A glance at Mr. Douglas's own record, from the beginning of his career down to his ill-starred and dishonorable repudiation of the Missouri Compromise, proves him to have been as strong and uncompromising an advocate of Congressional intervention in the government of the Territories as even David Wilmore himself. Just look at it!

In 1845, December 24th, while a joint resolution was pending, presented by Mr. Milton Brown, of Tennessee, for the admission of Texas into the Union, Mr. Douglas offered the following amendment:

"And in such State or States as may be formed out of said Territory north of said Missouri Compromise line, slavery or servitude shall be prohibited."—*Mr. S. Reports—1845-1846*, p. 798.

Here we have Mr. Douglas not only intervening in the "Territories," but in the "States." Did intervention mean disunion? Then again, on the 10th of August, 1848, while the bill for establishing the territorial government of Oregon was before the Senate, Mr. Douglas offered the following amendment:

"That inasmuch as said Territory is north of the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min.

of north latitude well known as the Missouri Compromise line," etc., etc., and upon this amendment Mr. Douglas is reported as having voted yea. Did "intervention mean disunion" then? This Oregon bill became a law on the 19th of August, 1848, and among other provisions contained the following:

SECTION 14. That the inhabitants of said Territory shall be entitled to enjoy all and singular the rights, privileges, and advantages granted and secured to the people of the Territory of the United States north-west of the river Ohio, by the act of compact contained in the ordinance for the government of said Territory, on the 13th of July, 1787, and shall be subject to all the conditions, restrictions, and prohibitions in said act of compact imposed upon the people of said Territory.

And on this provision Mr. Douglas voted in the affirmative. Here we have Mr. Douglas fully endorsing the old Jeffersonian ordinance, which "intervened" in favor of freedom, and saved all the north-west Territory from slavery. Did he regard that old compact as a "disunion" of the States? Did he regard it as "intervention means disunion" then?

In 1849, on the 23rd of October, Mr. Douglas delivered a famous speech in Springfield, in which he gave utterance to the following:

"The Missouri Compromise had the origin and the sanction of the people of the United States, conceived in the spirit of internal self-protection, and calculated to remove forever the danger which seemed to threaten, at one distant day, to sever the kindred people of this Union. All the evidence of public opinion at that day seemed to indicate that this Compromise had been sanctioned in the hearts of the American people as a sacred thing, which no ruthless hand could ever so recklessly choose to disturb."

Did Mr. Douglas think there was danger to the doctrine of Congressional intervention when he uttered these memorable words? Did he, when thus expressly declaring that the Missouri Compromise was calculated to remove forever the danger which seemed to threaten, at some distant day, to sever the social bonds of union, really think that "intervention meant disunion"?

Again, in 1850, on the 13th of March, Mr. Douglas defended the same Compromise against the assaults of John C. Calhoun, thus:

"The next in the series of aggressions complained of by the Senators from North Carolina, is the Missouri Compromise. This is a measure of Southern wrongs, Northern injustice, designed to deprive the South of her due share of the Territory. Why, sir, it was only six days that the Senator from Mississippi was in the Senate, and he has done of existing difficulties, because the Missouri Compromise has could not be extended to the Territories. This measure was originally adopted in the bill for the admission of Texas, by the vote of Northern and Southern yeas. My opinion has always professed to be willing to support every measure calculated to be a fair and honorable adjustment of a recent and difficult question. In 1845 it received the support of every Southern member of the House of Representatives—Whig and Democrat alike. It was the only alternative measure to the Wilmore Provision. And again, in 1848, as an amendment to the Oregon bill, my motion, it

received the vote, if I recollect right, not less than 100 yeas. I do not think I can possibly be mistaken—of every Southern Senator, Whig and Democrat, even including the Senator from South Carolina himself, (Mr. Calhoun). And yet we are now told that this is only done in the violence of 1787 in the series of aggressions on the South."—*Congressional Globe, Appendix, vol. 22*, p. 370.

Does this sound as though Mr. Douglas thought that "intervention meant disunion"? But one opinion, in continuation of this same subject of Congressional intervention, he said:

"But you say that we propose to prohibit your law by your emigrating to the Territories with your property. We mean to secure mine. We recognize your right in common with our own to emigrate to the Territories with your property, and there hold and enjoy it in subordination to the laws you may find, in some respects, different from your own, as the laws of the various States vary, on some points, from each other. Some of the laws are excluded by law in most of the States as well as Territories, as being unconstitutional. THE PRINCIPLES OF SOUND PUBLIC POLICY, however, will not permit us to prohibit from emigrating to Minnesota, Oregon, and California, with his bank, stock, or other property, the citizens of New York, but ceases to be so when taken into a State or Territory where banking is prohibited by the laws of that State. So ardent spirits, whiskey, brandy, all the intoxicating liquors, are recognized as property in most of the States, if not all the Territories; but not clause, whether from the local law, or the laws of the Indian country by the acts of Congress. NOR CAN A MAN GO THERE AND TAKE AND HOLD HIS SLAVE FOR THE SAME REASON. There are laws against the introduction, sale, and use of specific kinds of property, whether brought from the North or the South, or from foreign countries."—*Id.*, *Globe*, 1850, Appendix, 22, p. 371.

Glorious doctrine of non-intervention with which Mr. Douglas proposes to "save the country." What a strenuous advocate he was for it in 1850. Again we have him saying, "The Territories belong to the United States as one people, one nation, and one government, and are to be governed all, according to the principles of the Constitution. Each State, as a member of the Confederacy, has a right to a voice in forming the rules and regulations of the Territories, and the Territories, in distant sections—North, South, East, and West—have no such right. It is no variance or servitude, as a regular slavery."—*Id.*, *Globe*, Appendix, vol. 22, p. 371.

Again, when instructed by the Democratic Legislature of Illinois to vote for the Wilmore Provision, he said:

"I have no desire to break loose. My opinions are my own, and I express them freely. I have no desire to break loose from me here, and to whom I am responsible. I have never differed with my constituents in any matter of principle in Congress, except upon one solitary question, and that was after all settled. I HAVE NO CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTIES, and have previously taken the great principle of popular sovereignty, which is now required at this time. I have no desire, therefore, to break loose from me here, and to whom I am responsible."—*Id.*, *Globe*, March 13, Appendix, vol. 22, p. 371.

"Slavery, then, is PROHIBITED in all

the country acquired from Mexico, by a fundamental law—a constitutional provision, adopted by the inhabitants of the country, and which must continue in force FOREVER, unless repealed by competent authority. This doctrine is not new to me, nor is it now advanced by me for the first time."—*Id.*, *Globe*, 1850, vol. 12, p. 371, p. 372.

"Intervention means disunion" does it? If this is not, then, as fair a sample of a "disunion" doctrine as the country affords, we are no judges of the meaning of words. But farther than this, Mr. Douglas has not only endorsed and voted the whole creed of the Republican party, but he has gone to the length of Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Seward in favor of the doctrine of the "irrepressible conflict." Listen to his words:

"I have already had occasion to remark that at the time of the adoption of the Constitution there were twelve (Slave States), and six of them have since abolished slavery. THIS FACT SHOWS THAT THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM HAS STEADILY AND FIRMLY ADVANCED, WHILE SLAVERY HAS RECEDED IN THE SAME RATIO. It would be impossible to give a full and complete account of the progress of the cause of freedom, when I should have to name Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, and probably North Carolina, and Virginia, and the gradual operation of emancipation, under the operation of which these States must, in process of time, become free."

"Then, sir, the position of the Senator from South Carolina is entirely impotent. It is also inadmissible, if practically, if itself considered the fundamental principle of the Government. It would divide the people of the country into two (not popular sovereignty) which must necessarily form the basis of all institutions. IT WOULD BE A RETROGRADE MOVEMENT IN AN AGE OF PROGRESS THAT WOULD ANNIHILATE THE WORLD; to so amend the Constitution as to preserve an equilibrium between the slave and free States."—*Id.*, *Globe*, 1850, vol. 22, p. 371.

Talk about the Union not continuing, and the slave and free! Talk about the "irrepressible conflict" between free labor and slave labor! Stronger language could not be used than the above by Mr. Douglas to express exactly the same idea. Under the doctrine of Congressional intervention Mr. Douglas tells us "the cause of freedom has steadily and firmly advanced, while slavery has steadily and firmly receded in the same ratio," and that to revolutionize this fundamental principle of the Government would be a retrograde movement in an age of progress that would annihilation the world!"

Emphatic and prophetic words! "But now, friends, having exposed the conspiracy to 'destroy the great principles of popular equality, which are called in the same ratio,' and that to revolutionize this fundamental principle of the Government would be a retrograde movement in an age of progress that would annihilation the world!"

In our next we will give this "Artful Dodger's" record on the "great principle of popular sovereignty," but in the meantime we will give you a sample of the Missouri Compromise. In the mean time we commend to the serious consideration of all Douglas abolitionists the following record of the foregoing record. And before

they explain him on the subject of intervention being disunion, let them say, if they can, to their readers and to themselves, how it tallies with this latest hobby on which their Little Giant is now attempting to ride! Let them explain since when the doctrine of Congressional intervention, which has been the steady practice of the Government from its inauguration down, and has the endorsement of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Jackson, Clay, and even Douglas himself, has come to "mean disunion." The people would love to be informed.

MORE HYPOCRISY.

The Hon. Stephen A. Douglas has occasionally delivered himself in his recent post speech at Philadelphia.

"Pennsylvania has a mighty interest in the preservation of the Republic. She, from her agricultural position, is bound to remain as she began, the Arch of the Federal Union. [Applause.] Pennsylvania has the elements of an empire within her own limits; all the elements of greatness, and of greatness making a great country, to be found within the limits of the Keystone State. [Applause.] And, in my opinion, the people of Pennsylvania have come to the conclusion that the Congress of the United States can be better employed in devoting the great material resources of the country than by forcing slavery or anti-slavery upon the people. [Applause.]

This passage provokes the inquiry—When did Mr. Douglas first discover that Congress might constitutionally and beneficially employ itself in "developing the great material resources of the country?"

The idea is certainly not novel; but we have been listening to and reading after Mr. Douglas for the last twenty years, and can not remember ever having heard it, or anything like it, enunciated by him until this year of grace 1860, and in the presence of a Pennsylvania audience. We have a very good right to demand, therefore, that every effort to do, through the action of Congress, the development of the material resources of Pennsylvania, and her sisters in like condition, be, and be not by the most decided, thorough, unyielding support from Mr. Douglas. What, then, is the meaning of this novel demonstration? It is supposed that the Kansas letter would not be reported.

A CERTIFICATE IN TRUE-J. D. DeForest, a recent letter from Washington to the Indianapolis Journal, says: "Bates, it is said, by instinct knew a sinking ship so it with the agricultural office—Bates, it is said, is the next President, 'because,' said he, 'I want to get myself in the right position before the Lord, and I want to be a good man.' 'I can't give it up.' His friend told him that Lincoln would certainly be elected. 'I don't go?' said he, and continued, 'You want to devote me now, as it is said, to the cause of the slave, to the truth.' His friend reassured him that Lincoln would certainly be elected. 'Well, then,' said he, 'if that is so, I am for Lincoln myself, and I want you to give me a certificate in







